DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 068 043 HE 003 487

AUTHOR	Millett, John D.; And Others
TITLE	Personnel Management in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Academy for Educational Development, Inc., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Oct 72
NOTE	49p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Academy for Educational Development, Inc. 1424 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Personnel; *Administrative Principles; *Administrator Guides; *Educational Administration; *Higher Education; Management; *Personnel Management

ABSTRACT

This document on personnel management in higher education contains three papers that are designed to be used as guidelines for educational administrators. The first two papers, by John D. Millett, discuss the scope and problems of higher education administration and the problems associated with collective bargaining and tenure on college campuses. The final article, by Douglas G. MacLean and Hugh P. Avery, lists 163 ways to save money, reduce costs and avoid problems in personnel administration. (HS)

ED 068043

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

OCTOBER, 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 003 487

MANAGEMENT DIVISION
ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ED 068043

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

TWO PAPERS
Prepared for the Conference on
Confronting the Financial Crisis

by
John D. Millett
Vice President and
Director, Management Division

A SUMMARY OF DESIRABLE PERSONNEL ACTIONS

Prepared by
Douglas G. MacLean
Vice President, University of Houston
and
Hugh P. Avery
Director of Personnel Relations
Stevens Institute of Technology
Co-Leaders, Seminar X

Management Division
Academy for Educational Development, Inc.

October, 1972

Management Division
Academy for Educational Development
1424 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

CONTENTS

Scope and Problems 1
by John D. Millett

Tenure and Collective Bargaining 18
by John D. Millett

163 Ways to Save Money, Reduce Costs and
Avoid Problems in Personnel Administration 31
by Douglas G. MacLean and Hugh P. Avery

SCOPE AND PROBLEMS

PREFACE

Higher education has been experiencing great changes in recent years, through rapid growth in size coupled with some loss of financial resources. In line with these developments, personnel administration in higher education is entering a new phase in which the emphasis is upon personnel as a total resource of a college or university. Although higher education personnel administration is unique in that it must recognize differences in the handling of faculty personnel matters from the handling of administrative and support personnel, as in business, it encompasses the entire staffing of the enterprise as a coordinated whole.

Of primary consideration is the definition of personnel objectives. The first objective is individual competence in the job to be performed, but also important is an appropriate balance based upon racial, sexual and ethnic characteristics. In addition, student financial assistance in the form of undergraduate employment and recruitment of promising graduate students through employment must be considered.

A comprehensive personnel management program will include policies and procedures involving a number of important aspects. A total systems approach incorporating a table of organization, with job descriptions and job classifications, and procedures for training and development must be devised in such a way that the entire enterprise is well organized, but not inflexible. Set standards in wage and salary management, recruitment and placement, work supervision and evaluation, promotion, tenure and separation, fringe benefits, and safety and health will preclude many traditional problems. Finally, grievance procedures, retirement, and collective bargaining are current issues requiring careful attention.

A serious breakdown in personnel management is evidenced by failures in communication: failures in making personnel management policies reasonable and understandable to all individuals comprising the work force of the enterprise. Personnel administration should have and should have need of no secrets.

* * *

Just as All-Gaul was divided into three parts, there are at least three co-equal basic fundamentals in university management; indeed, in all management. These three basic fundamentals are planning management, budget management, and personnel management. I think any manager or administrator would be hard pressed to give any order of priority among these three essentials of operating performance. I concentrate attention here upon personnel management not to suggest the relative importance of the subject but in order to underline the scope and ramifications of this management concern in higher education today.

I think it is not unfair to observe that the personnel operations of our colleges and universities in this country "just growed", like Topsy. In my own lifetime I have seen higher education as an institution expand from an enrollment of one million students to an enrollment of nearly eight million students. I fear that in considerable part this process of rapid change failed to bring with it a correspondingly needed change in personnel management. The one area in which this observation is not correct would be in the non-academic personnel management of state universities. With the growth and improvement of state civil service systems, especially after 1935, state universities in turn have kept pace with, and perhaps even exceeded, the increasing competence of departments of state personnel.

The urgency of comprehensive personnel management in our colleges and universities in the 1970's scarcely needs illustration. The financial resources available to institutions of higher education are not expanding as they did in the past 15 years, and are even contracting. New pressures are being exerted for minority and for women recruitment, retention, and promotion. Indeed, I saw an article in the *New York Times* in June reporting that a federal government agency had informed the City University of New York to provide employment data on the race and sex of all staff personnel or to face the loss of all government research contracts. Although income threatens to stabilize, demands for wage and salary increases are continuing. And collective bargaining is now with us as a new means for making these demands more effective than ever before. At a time when labor market conditions are more favorable for adequate staffing than at any time since World War II, the resources for such staffing are more limited, enrollment growth has slowed down, and administrative discretion in personnel matters is becoming more and more restricted.

The other day I read in the newly published book of essays by Irving Kristol of New York University this arresting statement: "University administration in the United States today combines relative powerlessness with near-absolute mindlessness on the subject of education."[1] For the moment let us ignore the charge of mindlessness; this accusation deserves

---

[1] Irving Kristol, *On the Democratic Idea in America* (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), pp. 110-111.

one or more discussions of its own. But at least we can agree that the relative powerlessness of university administration in personnel management is a serious concern and will become an ever increasing concern in the years ahead.

In the discussion which follows, I have drawn heavily for my research upon a current management improvement study of personnel operations in the public universities of Ohio. The factual data have been collected by others. The arrangement of the data and the commentary which follow are my own.

There is one further observation which I would make at the outset. I want to make it clear that I have a broad concept of personnel management. I am well aware that academic practice based upon academic tradition tends to divide university personnel management into certain fixed, clearly distinct parts, none of which is supposed to intrude upon the other. There is one personnel procedure for faculty, a different personnel procedure for administrative officers, however defined, a third personnel procedure for the non-academic or classified staff, and possibly still a fourth procedure for student employment. Very few if any universities have organized personnel management as one comprehensive total concern of the enterprise.

I believe that this practice of compartmentalized personnel management should be and must be a thing of the past. Regardless of the various types of somewhat different kinds of personnel and different kinds of personnel procedure entailed in the staffing of the university enterprise, personnel management—I insist—is an integral whole. An academic department, for example, will probably include faculty, classified, and student personnel. Moreover, no academic department can operate with any effectiveness without classroom facilities and support activities, including the library, the registrar's office, the payroll office, the maintenance staff, and others. Just as the university enterprise must be planned as a whole and budgeted as a whole, it should be staffed as a whole.

PERSONNEL OBJECTIVES

The personnel function, like all functions of an enterprise, both operational and managerial, requires its definite, clearly formulated objectives. It is found in practice that most universities have not gotten around to setting forth with any precision what their actual personnel objectives are. Rather, the existence of some set of objectives is taken for granted, which means that few persons know what those objectives actually may be.

I believe that most rational individuals would agree that the number one objective of personnel management is the recruitment and retention of competent individuals to staff the university enterprise. Competence is a quality easy to specify. It is substantially more difficult to identify. Nonetheless, competence is the name of the game, and universities seek first of all to obtain qualified people to perform the various tasks of the

enterprise. The objective of competence is one no university can ever afford to ignore, from selection of a secretary for a department chairman to the appointment of a president. It is surprising how often competence as the number one purpose of personnel management tends to be overlooked.

Today on the current social scene, there is a second objective which threatens to take precedence over competence. This is the objective of racial, sexual, and even ethnic balance within the staffing of an enterprise. No one knows exactly how such balance shall be defined, and few are suggesting that balance must be achieved at the price of firing any existing staff persons. It is clear, however, that in the interests of non-discrimination, increased attention must be given to affirmative efforts to recruit and promote blacks, women, and ethnic group members to all salary and responsibility levels within the university structure.

Not long ago I had some personal experience in encountering the criticism of imbalance in the professional staffing of an organization. It was not enough, I was told, that the organization should have 40 percent of its clerical staff comprised of blacks and of persons of oriental heritage. I was informed in no uncertain terms that for only 6 percent of the professional staff to be black and only 12 percent of the professional staff to be female was not sufficient. I was not given any quota for the organization; I was simply told that the existing proportions were inadequate. I suspect this personal experience will shortly be a general experience.

The idea of balance in personnel management is certainly not foreign to the academic community. Academic departments have long insisted not just upon academic competence but equally upon academic balance in their recruitment. Balance has been sought among specialties within a discipline; balance has been sought among political and religious points of view; balance has been sought among research and instructional interests. The idea of a different kind of balance is one to which the academic community must now adjust itself in the interests of economic and professional integration in a multi-racial, multi-cultural society.

But competence and balance are not the sole objectives which have influenced personnel management within our universities. There have been other objectives which have motivated personnel management, such as the objective of graduate student recruitment and the objective of undergraduate student financial assistance.

In our state universities in particular, as we are all aware, appointment as a teaching assistant has been the principal means available for the recruitment of good graduate students. There is no need here to explore all the implications, instructional and financial, involved in this practice. I am by no means implying any criticism of the arrangement. I do wish to point out, however, that the objective of enrolling good graduate students does need to be integrated with the objective of competent instruction. It is my impression that in many instances the personnel objective of competent instruction has been subordinated to the student recruitment objec-

tive of enrolling good graduate students. A satisfactory faculty personnel operation should prevent this distortion.

At the undergraduate level of student affairs in our state universities, student employment has been the major source of student financial assistance, especially at a state university which enrolls primarily residential rather than commuting or part-time students. I have listened to many discussions among university administrators whether or not job performance should be the primary concern in hiring student workers. There is some disposition to argue that financial needs of the student should be the first criterion in student employment, and I believe federal regulations in connection with the work-study grants have tended to reinforce attention to this factor. My own personal conviction is that job performance should be the primary prerequisite in student hiring and in student continued employment.

Recently I have noticed that in the collective bargaining negotiations at several state universities the local unit of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees demanded that student employment be curtailed in the interests of job security and of minority recruitment. My judgment would be that this kind of demand will be presented ever more frequently in the future and that state universities will need to be prepared to meet it.

In any event, I believe that enough has been mentioned here to suggest the importance which must be accorded to the objectives of the personnel function of universities. Without objectives carefully and clearly defined, a university cannot expect to achieve an effective personnel operation. It is from a set of definite objectives that all other procedures of personnel management necessarily proceed.

PROBLEMS AND POLICIES

Let us turn now to a consideration of the major areas of personnel concern within universities. It is almost impossible here to avoid the impression of a mere cataloguing of the chapter headings from any useful text on the subject of personnel management. I shall pass by the obvious aspects of personnel management and some of the details which are vitally essential to a personnel manager. Nonetheless, some indication of the scope of concerns in personnel management today is indispensable for the president and his principal associates in the administration of the university enterprise.

1. **Table of Organization.** The first prerequisite in an adequate personnel system for a university is a table of organization. I am not certain whether or not the term "table of organization" is as familiar today to academic administrators as it was some 25 years ago to all of us with military experience in World War II. If table of organization is unfamiliar, perhaps manning table is a more meaningful label.

We must not forget that a college or university is a labor intensive enterprise. In a major university with extensive research and public service projects, we found that as much as 65 percent of the total operating budget went for the purchase of personal services. In a university with limited doctoral program offerings, we found that as much as 75 percent of the budget was expended as compensation for personal services.

Before any other efforts at personnel management can be undertaken, the staffing requirements for each work unit of the university must be established. We are all familiar with the importance of the faculty work load standard, whether or not expressed as a student-faculty ratio, as class credit courses offered, or as total student class credit units produced. We all know that the staffing pattern for instruction is a major determinant of university expense. But staffing patterns for administrative positions, for research projects, for public service projects, and for auxiliary services are equally important.

If we project a student-faculty ratio of 12 to 1 or 18 to 1, or if we know that the average course credit units produced by a faculty member is 320, we know something about the staffing requirements for instruction. But have we analyzed administrative and other staffing needs by any careful standard? Our Ohio study found that in administrative staffing there was a clustering of experience around one officer for every 90 students, and one classified staff member for every 23 students. Or, expressed differently, we found 55 faculty members for every 1,000 students, 11 administrative officers for every 1,000 students, and 43 classified personnel for every 1,000 students. These numbers applied to the instructional budgets and not to the budgets for research, public service, and auxiliary services.

Obviously, the mission and the work load standard determine the staffing requirements for each work unit in the organizational structure of the university enterprise. In this way the manning table for each work unit and for the entire enterprise is established.

A concern for work load cannot readily be separated from a concern for the available income of the enterprise. In our universities there is no end to the good works, the useful services which we might undertake to perform. But limited resources necessarily determine both what we perform and how much we perform. I am convinced that for many reasons, including the emergence of collective bargaining, our universities must be far more exact than in the past in fixing and reviewing work load standards and the resulting staffing requirements of each unit of their structure.

2. **Job Descriptions and Job Classification.** The personnel technician or analyst considers job description and job classification as indispensable tools of his trade. When I first entered full-time government service in an administrative capacity in 1941, I quickly learned that job description was more than a procedure; it was also a game in the use of the appropriate words for the desired job classification. I suspect there is still a good deal of game playing in personnel management today.

My interest here, however, is in certain broader issues beyond those of formal work assignment and of equal pay for equal work, important as both of these matters may be. As I have already noted, the primary classification of all university personnel as faculty, administrative officers, classified, and student is of fundamental importance. But within this primary classification there are further subdivisions of equal importance: full-time versus part-time; tenured faculty versus non-tenured faculty; academic officers versus business officers; clerical staff versus the skilled trades; food service staff versus the custodial staff; the security force versus the grounds staff. These classifications will become increasingly important in terms of both wage administration and collective bargaining.

My current connection with the economic stabilization program of the federal government has impressed upon me two needs which previously had not appeared as higher education imperatives. One of these is the necessity of current and accurate statistical data about numbers of personnel and about wage payments by major classifications. The other is the careful definition of the appropriate employee unit for both wage administration and collective bargaining purposes.

I would guess that in the language of the economists an incomes policy and program are with us for a long time to come. Indeed, as a political scientist, I now read the relationship of the federal government to the changing economy of this nation as demanding a wage and salary control of some kind if the goals of full employment, increased material prosperity, and a relatively stable price level are to be realized. If I am correct about this reading, then job classification and wage management are more vital concerns of university administration than ever before.

3. Wage and Salary Management. It is appropriate at this time, then, to add a few words about wages and salaries. Obviously, every job also entails an hourly wage rate or an annual salary. The wage and salary scales of classified employees have usually been determined by state government civil service law. In general, state governments have delegated authority for determination of faculty salaries, salaries of principal administrative officers, and the wage rates of students to boards of trustees or to boards of regents. I think it is desirable that this kind of discretionary authority remain vested in boards of trustees.

For the most part, faculty members have resisted fixed salary schedules with a definite entering salary and periodic salary increments. In the name of the merit principle, administrative officers, including department chairmen, have enjoyed considerable discretion in recommending specific salary arrangements to boards of trustees. In addition, there has been a long time academic tradition not to publish the salaries of individual faculty members and administrative officers. Such data have been presented in detail usually to board members as an annex to the budget document of the university, but seldom if ever has this annex then been published for general public use. In some state governments the individual

salary figures for faculty members and administrative officers have been available through the state auditor's office.

The salary management of the past is now under attack on two fronts. First, increasingly, state government executives and legislators have shown concern about the level of academic and administrative salaries in public universities. There is a widespread legislative belief that faculty salaries are already unreasonably high and that the pressures for increased tax support of public universities could be reduced if salaries were stabilized at current levels. And, because of budget limitations, there are some state governments where there has been no faculty salary increase approved by the state legislature for two or three years. It is not unreasonable to expect that the legislative response to requests for increased tax support will more and more become one of questionning the salary practices of public universities.

Secondly, I notice a tendency for collective bargaining demands that stress the need for fixed salary schedules with automatic increments in salary increases. If we are about to enter an era of extensive collective bargaining, I would predict that salary schedules for faculty members will become an integral part of negotiated agreements and that there will be a distinct trend toward more equal treatment of all faculty members insofar as salaries are concerned.

I personally am convinced that it is highly desirable today for public universities to publish their salary schedules in detail with complete disclosure of the salary figure for each and every faculty member and for each and every principal administrative officer. I am well aware that there continues to be some resistence to this kind of disclosure among senior faculty members and among top administrative officers. In a public university and under present circumstances I believe that no valid reason exists for a failure to provide the public with complete salary information.

It is also clear that minority groups and women groups will continue to press for complete salary disclosure in order to obtain data which will seem to suggest some form of salary discrimination. There is no adequate response to accusations and rumors of such discrimination in the absence of full salary disclosure. The sooner we accept this necessity the sooner we shall begin to escape from some of the external criticism. In this connection, I would like to repeat my earlier statement that in any event I anticipate increased governmental control over all wage and salary increases in the future.

4. Recruitment and Placement. It seems quite clear that the traditional procedure in faculty recruitment is about to become a thing of the past. Recently the alumni of the graduate faculties of Columbia University received the account of a presentation on the subject of the University response to the requirement of an affirmative action plan for recruitment of additional women to the faculty. It is only a matter of time until a similar affirmative action program must be adopted by every public and

private university receiving any federal government funds. The essence of such an affirmative action program is a much more extensive, in fact exhaustive, recruitment effort than has been the practice in the past.

Similarly, affirmative action programs are now the rule in recruitment of administrative officers and classified personnel. Such affirmative action programs are expected for both minority recruitment and for women recruitment. I have already noticed on organization charts of some universities the appearance of a new principal administrative officer: the director of affirmative action programs.

Recruitment begins with the determination of standards of work performance. Ordinarily these have been stated in terms of educational attainment and work experience, often supplemented by test results. Increasingly, attacks are being made upon these work standards as being unreasonably exacting and as discriminatory against minority and women recruitment. It is clear that work standards must necessarily come under extensive review and even modification in the interests of a changing pattern of recruitment results.

In personnel management placement has usually been considered distinct from recruitment. Recruitment has meant the establishment of work specifications and the determination of individuals qualified to meet those specifications and available for appointment. Placement has meant the final act of agreement whereby the employer decides the satisfactory qualifications of an individual and an individual decides the satisfactory status of salary and working conditions. Placement also involves such orientation to the job as the employer finds appropriate. In general, particularly at the faculty level, placement has been a fairly haphazard procedure. In the future, placement will undoubtedly become more and more highly formalized. In addition, job orientation affords a particular opportunity for a university to enlist the interests and the support of all new staff members.

It appears more and more evident that a formal contract of employment may become an essential part of the placement procedure. In the past, such contracts for faculty personnel and principal administrative officers have usually set forth no more than the designation of the position, the salary to be provided and the duration of the contract terms. Nothing has been said about work load and performance standards. Occasionally there has been a reference to some other document having to do with fringe benefits and other terms and conditions of employment. In the future, contracts of employment are apt to become increasingly specific and lengthy. To the extent that terms and conditions of employment are not set forth in a collective bargaining agreement or memorandum of understanding, then similar details may very well be incorporated into the body of individual contractual agreements.

In December, 1970, the Education Commission of the States, based in Denver, published a report by Robert L. Williams of the University of Michigan, entitled, *Faculty Work Load–Alternative Methods of Evalua-*

tion. The tabular data in this report in turn were extracted from a little book by Dr. Williams published by the University of Michigan Press in 1965, entitled, *The Administration of Academic Affairs in Higher Education.* I assume that all academic administrators are familiar with this exceedingly helpful volume. Academic administrators involved in the problem of work load standards would do well to become equally familiar with the ECS report.

A faculty work load analysis is an indispensable tool of personnel management within any university. A comparison of such data among public universities is also needed at the level of state government. Inevitably such data reveal considerable differences among departments, among fields of study, and among universities. In the most recent faculty work load analysis in Ohio, we found an average faculty work week was 44 hours. In a public university where instructional activity was emphasized, we found that 35 hours a week were devoted to instructional activity including student advising, 5 hours a week were devoted to administrative duties, and 4 hours a week to research and public service. In a comprehensive university we found the prevailing pattern to be 25 hours a week devoted to instructional activity, 5 hours a week devoted to administrative activity, and 14 hours a week devoted to research and public service.

An important feature of working conditions today is the policy about outside employment, about "moonlighting". A few years ago a survey by the National Science Foundation found that 47 out of 54 major research universities had a definite written policy on the subject of outside employment of faculty, especially consulting employment. The usual features of such a policy involved prior approval of outside employment, some specification of acceptable outside activity, some time or salary limitation to outside employment, and some restriction upon the use of institutional facilities for consulting activity. But faculty members are not the only individuals involved in such outside employment. Administrative officers and classified personnel may also undertake outside endeavor. A formulation of general standards of external activity and the enforcement of these standards are vital current needs.

5. Training and Individual Development. Just as universities have tended to overlook the formal aspects of placement, so have they also tended to ignore job training and individual development for staff members. At the faculty level, any job training or individual development efforts seemed inconsistent with the nature of the academic profession. The faculty member personally and individually was expected to pursue his or her own career. Any training for this career was deemed superfluous for an individual who had achieved the Doctor of Philosophy or similar degree. Subsequent professional development was entirely in the hands of the individual faculty members. Professional associations rather than the university itself afforded the means for the individual to advance his own competencies in his profession.

I have never forgotten the job training I received for my first assignment as a teaching assistant. My instructions consisted of the admonition: "Go meet your class and don't forget to be interesting". I assume I fulfilled these job specifications. I knew a fellow graduate student who apparently had dramatic capabilities which were far greater than mine. I was told that he appeared in class to discuss the election of 1840 in a coonskin cap. For some time now my fellow student has been a member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

At the classified level, job training has generally been acquired on the job, with such assistance and such instruction as each individual supervisor was inclined to provide. It is little wonder that job training under these circumstances was often haphazard and incomplete. Indeed, it is my impression that supervisors and administrators in the university enterprise have seldom if ever been made aware of the personnel obligations inherent in their management role.

Furthermore, except in terms of faculty rank, we have been remiss in providing information or encouragement for individual staff members about avenues of job promotion, or about the requirements for such promotion. Here again the requirements of our day suggest that personnel development for supervisory and administrative positions particularly will become increasingly a part of a comprehensive, alert personnel management within our universities.

6. Work Supervision and Evaluation. The academic tradition has belittled any form of work supervision and of evaluation. In reality, such supervision and evaluation have always existed, but they have been performed on an informal, almost hearsay basis. Among administrative officers and classified personnel there have been somewhat more definite means of work evaluation in terms of job performance and of staff satisfaction. But even among these groups there has been very little in the way of formal work evaluation other than such rating sheets as state civil service practice may have afforded.

The concern of our day with job security, with tenure, with job rights enforceable in a court of law clearly forecasts the need for much more carefully formulated procedures of work evaluation, with careful recording of standards, measurements, and observation. I know of one court case in which a non-tenured faculty member claimed discrimination in the decision not to renew his contract of appointment. Fortunately for the department chairman, the dean, the academic vice-president and the president involved in this case, there existed an extensive file of information and of letters of the individual which convinced the judge that there had been no discrimination in the refusal to continue employment. In the absence of that file I am confident the university would have lost its case.

7. Promotion. I remember during World War II hearing Secretary Stimson remark from his vast experience in government service that he had never met an enlisted man in the Army who wasn't convinced he ought to

be a master sergeant and that he had never met an officer who wasn't convinced he ought to be at least a full colonel. I suspect few of us have known a faculty member who wasn't convinced he ought to be a full professor, or an administrative officer who wasn't convinced he ought to be at least a vice president, or a classified employee who wasn't convinced he ought to be a supervisor at grade 20 or whatever the top classification may be.

Promotion is, of course, a procedure for periodic recognition of work accomplishment and of assignment to duties of additional authority and of responsibility. Regardless of the warning contained in the Peter Principle, promotion is an essential means for conveying institutional approbation. It is also a recognized, I am tempted to say, appropriate means for filling all the various positions in the table of organization.

We could debate at length the relative virtues of promotion from within versus recruitment of faculty, administrative, and supervisory positions from outside the immediate enterprise. For the past 30 years an individual university has not been considered as a career choice; the academic profession has been the career rather than a particular institution. With the changing conditions of the academic market place, I believe we have now entered a new era in which a particular university will become a career service for faculty, administrative staff, and others.

This change will call for a whole new approach to personnel management in which initial recruitment is more crucial than ever and in which promotion criteria become a major factor in job satisfaction. Promotion policies and promotion standards will be expected to be provided for every identifiable career ladder within each university. A slow-down in expansion for a particular university means a change also in the opportunities for promotion.

8. Tenure and Separation. Tenure is of course a faculty tradition in most if not all universities. The little volume published in 1959 by Cornell University Press, entitled, *Tenure in American Higher Education*, written by Clark Byse and Louis Joughin remains the best discussion of the subject available to us. In addition, state civil service law provides basic features of job security to all classified personnel.

The new problem of our time is that of the probationary period preceding tenure or job security. It appears that faculty and classified personnel alike are expecting the concept of a probationary period of job performance to be abandoned, or to become so routine as to be meaningless! Some very strenuous efforts are going to be needed before probation will once again become a viable procedure in work evaluation. I think these efforts must be made.

The slow-down in academic mobility will have two consequences for university personnel management. It will be much more difficult in the future to recruit faculty personnel from outside at senior levels of placement. Such action may block the upward promotion of academic staff of

junior level, and these faculty members will oppose the practice. Secondly, a college or university may soon find that from having 40 or 50 percent of its faculty on tenure status, it will have two-thirds or three-quarters of all faculty with tenure. Academic flexibility and innovation may suffer as a consequence.

In these circumstances the process of work separation becomes highly critical. Work separation is never a pleasant prospect or today a simple procedure. But if standards of work performance are to be maintained in an enterprise, from time to time managers must be willing to insist upon the resort to work separation. Thanks to W. Todd Furniss we now have a good reminder of the essential elements of separation procedure. His article in the Fall, 1971, issue of the *Educational Record*, entitled, "Giving Reasons for Nonrenewal of Faculty Contracts" should be required reading for all academic administrators. With some appropriate modifications the same precautions set forth by Dr. Furniss are equally applicable to civil service personnel.

It is not fair to say that work separation has become impossible on the American academic scene. It is proper to say that work separation is now surrounded by far more procedural safeguards than ever before. The next step, and I suspect it may well be at hand, is to provide the same work separation safeguards to all principal administrative officers.

Some public universities are experiencing as much as a one-quarter to one-third annual rate of turn-over in their classified or state civil service personnel. This very high rate of turn-over is attributed to state pay scales which are substantially below those of the local labor market. As employees acquire some skill and some work experience they then tend to seek the better paying employment opportunities in the labor area. As a result, universities become labor training agencies and their costs of operation become correspondingly higher.

9. Grievance Procedure. A major goal in personnel management is to promote and hopefully to achieve job satisfaction for all personnel. The task is not simple, and entails a whole range of psychological considerations. The literature of our time about the human relations of management is voluminous indeed.

No matter how well versed any supervisor, manager or administrator may be in the personal aspects of job satisfaction, in any large-scale enterprise there will need to be a carefully formulated policy and procedure for the consideration of individual grievances. I think it is indicative of the state of personnel management within higher education that in almost every instance where collective bargaining emerges a first demand is for the establishment of grievance machinery. If we had been more sensitive to the handling of employee grievances in the past, we would have less employee demands in the present.

10. Fringe Benefits. Needless to say, every salary in our colleges and universities today carries with it additional obligations for fringe benefits.

It is not necessary here to debate the desirable scope of fringe benefits made available to higher education personnel: paid holidays, paid vacation, paid sick leave, Blue Cross-Blue Shield, major medical insurance, disability insurance, accident insurance, unemployment insurance, social security, workmen's compensation, retirement contributions, term life insurance, and educational benefits. The obvious fact is the cost of these fringe benefits as a part of the operating expense of an institution.

Thanks to the annual studies of the AAUP with which we are all now familiar, we are accustomed to think in terms of an annual salary and an annual compensation cost for all faculty personnel. I wish to suggest that we need to think in terms of an annual compensation cost for every single person in the table of organization of a college or university, and it is this annual compensation cost which should appear in the personal services budget of every unit of university organization. Now that fringe benefit costs are approaching 30 percent of salary costs, no college or university can afford to be indifferent to this expense or to the full disclosure of this expense to all concerned. It is also evident that a full vesting of retirement benefits and improved mobility in academic employment are current imperatives.

11. **Safety and Health.** Since both public and private institutions of higher education are being brought today under the coverage of social welfare legislation, including unemployment compensation and workmen's compensation, our institutions need to give increased attention to the safety and health aspects of their working conditions. In our public universities we have perhaps been somewhat lax on occasion in worrying about safety arrangements simply because we enjoy the immunity of state sovereignty from tort litigation. Even if such immunity still attaches to some of our operations in relation to the public, that immunity has now largely disappeared in our relations to employees.

Our health programs in the past have been confined to an annual tuberculosis examination, and I have experienced some difficulty in the enforcement of this rule for all university personnel. Today, we need to ask ourselves whether or not a much more extensive health requirement may be needed as a condition of entry upon employment and as a periodic condition of continued employment.

Furthermore, it is quite clear that much greater attention must be given to the safety features of our working conditions. Since our costs of workmen's compensation are based upon our experience rating, we have a definite economic incentive to worry about staff safety. One university recently reduced its workmen's compensation costs by 65 percent through the full-time efforts of a safety officer.

12. **Retirement.** In the category of academic personnel in particular, I am convinced that we shall soon be facing substantial pressures to encourage earlier retirement. By earlier retirement I mean retirement at 60 years of age or shortly thereafter rather than retirement at 68 or 70 years of

age. With large numbers of young graduate students seeking academic placement and with young faculty members seeking academic promotion to the ranks of associate and full professor, there will be reason indeed to encourage early retirement.

I must confess to mixed emotions about this retirement business. Most of us older faculty and administrative types think that, like the taste of a good wine, our wisdom mellows and improves with age. Moreover, the academic life is not so strenuous that we are unable physically to perform our duties after 60 years of age. And I sympathize with my 80 year old professorial colleague who told me this spring that he wanted to live another ten years in order to see how the current mess in society would turn out!

I see no simple solution to this retirement business, even as there appears to be no simple solution to poverty, pollution, and over-population. I can only say that pressure for early retirement means additional retirement costs if the retiree is not to live in unhappy poverty. And I can only hope that academic wisdom will become more than a function of age.

13. Collective Bargaining. Obviously, collective bargaining on the part of college or university staff is far too complicated to be discussed in a paragraph or two. I think it is evident that the economic problems of service occupations in general and the financial problems of higher education in particular are such today that faculty members and other staff personnel will be strongly tempted to resort to collective bargaining in the hope that this new procedure will somehow, some way prove beneficial. I think the hope may prove misplaced, but no administrative officer can expect to be able to prove this to his faculty and staff associates.

I think the present interest in collective bargaining presents all colleges and universities with a new imperative: to involve all elements of the academic community in the budget process and to present complete information including individual compensation data to all faculty members, students, staff, and other concerned individuals. There ought to be no financial secrets about a college or university.

14. Communication. This last statement properly introduces the final observation I wish to make about personnel policy and practice in higher education. Communication is the very essence of personnel management today. Whether or not we have collective bargaining in our colleges and universities, the essence of academic employment is a contractual relationship between the corporation entity which is the legal governing authority and the individual staff members from custodian to president. Since most colleges and universities utilize an annual or periodic contract of very general terms, it remains for university by-laws and policy statements to spell out the details of the contractual relationship. These by-laws and policy statements perform much of the same function as the detailed statutes on civil service employment in government.

Obviously, the communication of these contractual arrangements is vital to the shared understanding of the mutual obligations and responsibilities of university employment. I have before me the academic personnel policies guide of one particular state college system. It is an attractive publication of some 20 pages divided into sections headed academic freedom and tenure, appointments, promotions, salary schedule, teaching loads, leaves, dismissal, retirement, and fringe benefits. I have also before me the employees' handbook for the civil service staff of a large state university. It begins with a description of the role of the personnel office and then presents detailed information about work time and pay, benefits, probationary period, performance ratings, absences, promotions, seniority, transfers, accidents, discipline, grievance procedure, reemployment, security, layoffs, and employee organization.

It is interesting to contrast a staff personnel manual with a collective bargaining agreement. One particular agreement in a state college system contains some 20 articles, with a number of appendices. The various articles deal with definitions of terms, relationships between faculty and the board of trustees, fringe benefits, academic freedom, selection of department chairmen, participation in decision-making, work load, promotion and tenure, extra duties, grievance procedure, and budget consultation.

Employee newsletters are being widely discontinued as an economy measure, and the utility of this kind of communication needs careful assessment. University ombudsmen, where such officials have been appointed, report that about 75 percent of all staff complaints as distinct from student complaints received by them relate to personnel matters.

It is my firm conviction that breakdowns in communications about personnel policies and procedures have had much to do with current demands for collective bargaining and for a more highly structured relationship between staff and boards of trustees.

CONCLUSION

There are no easy answers to the personnel management problems and policies of colleges and universities. The board of trustees and the administrators of a university accept with their appointment the obligation to conserve the personnel assets of the enterprise even as they must seek to conserve the physical and financial assets of the enterprise.

There are those currently who say that our colleges and universities need a total systems approach to personnel management, including careful integration of objectives, work load standards, plant resources, and financial resources with staffing patterns. In this effort, long-range planning and prediction models become necessary tools in the decision-making process.

To the systems approach must be added organization analysis as a control of staffing commitments. Organization analysis is much more than an organization chart or a work-flow process. It is fundamentally a struc-

ture of job assignments, work load expectations, performance standards, and performance accountability. Moreover, organization structure cannot afford to be static. It demands periodic evaluation and adjustment in the light of changing needs and circumstances.

Within this framework of systems planning and work structure, all the various items of personnel management outlined herein have their appropriate place. The danger is that the consideration of these problems and of the policy response to staffing requirements will become routine rather than dynamic, traditional rather than innovative.

In a recent study of university personnel management a number of favorable features were cited: professionalization of the personnel function, improved job classification, better job performance evaluation, improved grievance procedure, increased attention to women and minority recruitment, most policy and procedural requirements specified in writing, and better communication. The common failings in personnel management were listed as sketchy job specifications and poor testing of competence, inadequate in-service orientation and training, poor salary evaluations, inadequate personnel records, and failings in personnel organization and staffing. The recommended improvements included: centralization of all personnel management on a university-wide basis, programs of staff development, a comprehensive personnel data system on a computerized basis, pre-employment medical examinations, a comprehensive job classification scheme, completion of personnel policy decisions and written personnel procedures, and more sophisticated handling of collective bargaining procedures. The most important single improvement sought by faculty and classified staff was a definite involvement in all decision-making procedures involving personnel issues.

I know that many college and university administrators feel uncomfortable with the scope and magnitude of personnel management today. Some administrators have about reached the state of thinking on personnel management which was characteristic of corporation management in this country in 1930. I have yet to meet a business manager who would listen with any sympathy to a recital of the personnel woes of a university president. Rather, the almost universal response I have encountered has been the statement: "It's time universities joined the party." It's time, they say, for universities to learn what business has had to worry about in the Wagner Labor Relations Act, the Social Security Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Equal Employment Opportunities Act, the Civil Rights Act, the Walsh-Healey Act and other laws on governmental contracting, the Occupational Safety and Health Act, and an extensive array of other legislation and court decisions.

Personnel management in colleges and universities is only now coming of age. I hope there is yet time for it to mature and to acquire the wisdom of time and experience.

TENURE AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

PREFACE

Two aspects of higher education management, tenure and collective bargaining, together help to determine the role a faculty will play within each college or university.

The current concern about tenure is twofold: whether or not the practice of tenure is hampering the development and enforcement of standards of individual job performance, and whether or not the practice of tenure is hampering the adjustment of personnel to the changing economic circumstances of individual colleges and universities. When does protection of academic freedom become, instead, protection of professional incompetence? Can either concept be measured or defined?

The question of tenure raises another question, concerning the necessity of terminations during financial crisis. What is an acceptable procedure? Collective bargaining by faculty members is today a reality in a number of colleges and universities. Although these members may be concerned more with salary than with terminations, the two are closely related. The concept of collective bargaining has been borrowed from the productive sector of the economy as a guarantee of labor participation in the economic gains of an advancing productivity. It has also been derived from the service sector as a protective device to ensure income redistribution for governmental and other employees, when there is no objective measure of growth and wage increases are therefore inflationary.

Faculty members will have to resolve for themselves such questions as whether or not they wish to engage in collective bargaining, in the first place; then they must decide whom to choose for their bargaining agent and the scope of their membership. The basic problem in collective bargaining, however, focuses on who shall pay the bill for higher salaries and improved working conditions: the taxpayer or the student? With whom will they bargain, since the administration and trustees do not have full control over salary? Finally, by what procedure shall the interests of both taxpayer and student be brought to the bargaining table?

* * *

The current concern in American higher education about tenure and about collective bargaining arises from varied sources. Criticism of the practice of tenure has arisen from those who are dissatisfied for sundry reasons with faculty performance within the academic community. The pressures for collective bargaining arise from faculty members who believe themselves disadvantaged in the current race for higher wages in the American economy. If we link a discussion of tenure with that of collective bargaining, we do so because both issues vitally affect the faculty role within each individual college or university in this country.

Tenure has been the principal arrangement within American higher education to protect the doctrine of academic freedom. The case for tenure was succinctly put nearly twenty years ago by Professor Robert M. MacIver of Columbia University when he wrote about the right to conditions of tenure as the means of ensuring a faculty member against dismissal or professional penalization on grounds other than professional incompetence or conduct which in the judgment of his colleagues rendered him unfit to be a faculty member. The 1940 statement of the American Association of University Professors coupled a concern for economic security with that of academic freedom as the justification for tenure.

I think it is safe to say that today tenure is under attack not because it is a protection of academic freedom but because it may be a protection for faculty incompetence. The most vigorous proponents of academic freedom have always acknowledged the possibility that a faculty member might be professionally incompetent or personally guilty of misconduct. Unfortunately, these same proponents have not attempted to define either professional incompetence or personal misconduct. Rules establishing standards of competence and proper behavior were left to the boards of trustees to enact, and controversies about the enforcement of these standards were expected to be adjudicated on a case by case basis.

In our time tenure is being questioned under two somewhat different sets of circumstances. One circumstance arises out of conflict about the appropriate role of faculty members within the academic community. The other circumstance arises from the conditions of the "new depression" which has beset American higher education.

In the student revolution of the 1960's, a common complaint has been that of faculty neglect of their instructional obligations. In reviewing the history of the academic profession over the past twenty-five years, I believe that we may fairly conclude that many faculty members tended to place their research and their public service interests above their instructional duties. And in considerable degree we should observe that extensive federal governmental grants and the accord of substantial public prestige encouraged these priorities. In the process, undergraduate instruction in particular seemed below the dignity of many faculty members.

After our unfortunate and tragic disruptions of May, 1970, in Ohio, our General Assembly established a select committee on campus unrest. Three

subcommittees of five legislators each visited each one of our public university campuses during the summer of 1970. A second visit was made in the autumn of that same year. The members of this select committee informed me that the most common single complaint about each university voiced by those students who sought an opportunity to appear before these subcommittees was the charge of faculty neglect of instructional activities. When the committee sought an explanation for this situation, the response of administrative officers was that conditions of tenure prevented them from attempting to change faculty behavior.

It is little wonder that during our lengthy budget battle in the Ohio General Assembly in 1971, extending from March 15 to December 20, I encountered three adamant attitudes within the legislature. Moreover, these attitudes were shared by Republican and Democratic legislators alike; the arguments were by no means partisan in a political sense. These attitudes were, first, a flat refusal to approve any appropriation which seemed to encourage faculty research activity; secondly, an insistence that some statement of faculty work load must be set forth in law which would emphasize the faculty instructional role; and, thirdly, some desire to eliminate the practice of tenure if this indeed was a factor in faculty indifference to undergraduate teaching.

My own efforts to suggest to legislators that student criticisms were exaggerated met with little success. I was able to avoid any legislative action to make conditions of tenure illegal within state universities. But the General Assembly took great satisfaction in its efforts to specify a faculty work load standard and to emphasize legislative intent that faculty members were paid to give greater attention to undergraduate students.

It is no exaggeration to say that the whole concept of tenure is undergoing serious reassessment at this time. The basic question which is being asked is whether or not tenure is an essential practice in order to ensure academic freedom. Many persons, including many faculty members, are responding that the practice of tenure and the protection of academic freedom are separable. Indeed, they are saying that tenure has really contributed very little in actual experience to the preservation of academic freedom. Rather, the conviction is growing among many faculty members that tenure has turned out in reality to be an arrangement for the protection of faculty incompetence, or for the encouragement of faculty indifference to professional performance.

There is a useful discussion of alternatives to the practice of tenure in the January, 1972, issue of the *Journal of Higher Education.* In this article President Louis C. Vaccaro of Marycrest College calls particular attention to the new experiment in a "contract for service" being tried at Hampshire College. In this arrangement, the individual faculty member negotiates with the administration of the college setting forth the scope of services, objectives of service, conditions of service, and remuneration to be provided during the contract period, which may be from three to five years. Personally, I think there is merit in this idea of expanding the terms

of a faculty contract, and I believe this possibility deserves more general use. There are other alternatives to the practice of tenure. One is the replacement of tenure with a procedure of compulsory arbitration in cases where termination of an appointment results in a charge of violation of the principle of academic freedom. Another possibility is a practice of periodic review of professional performance by an academic panel with termination of a continuous contract upon a finding of professional incompetence or professional inadequacy.

Concern about tenure is today widespread among academic administrators because of economic pressures. The 1940 AAUP statement recognized that the services of a faculty member might be terminated "under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies." In setting forth an interpretation of "acceptable academic practice" in terminating a faculty appointment, the 1940 statement declared simply: "Termination of a continuous appointment because of financial exigency should be demonstrably bona fide." It was entirely appropriate that a statement written in 1940 near the end of our nation's most prolonged and bitter economic depression should recognize the possibility of "financial exigency."

In the circumstances of 1972 and 1973—after nearly a decade of unparalleled affluence in the American economy accompanied by mounting inflation, economic recession, and social conflict—termination of continuous academic appointments for reasons of financial exigency raises issues not anticipated in 1940. For example, is termination of continuous appointments to be undertaken only after all other possible economies of operation have been achieved? What shall be considered to constitute all other possible economies of operation: the termination of all non-tenure appointments, the reduction of administrative and operating staff, the curtailment of faculty support expense, a cut-back in non-instructional services including the financing of student assistance?

Another example of current complexity is the issue whether or not termination of continuous appointment must be made in order of seniority, those with the least seniority being the first to have their appointments terminated. All of us know of situations where students have asserted that younger faculty members are personally more acceptable to them than older faculty members. Seniority in a tenure system is then viewed as a means of perpetuating faculty appointments which are personally disagreeable to a considerable number of students. Should student sentiment and even student evaluation, where these sentiments and evaluation can be ascertained, be controlling in cases where continuous appointment is to be terminated because of financial exigencies?

Recently, I learned of extensive discussion within one college about the dangers of making any additional commitments to faculty tenure. This particular private college was facing a situation where a new public institution was scheduled to open in the near future. The private college was

fearful that its own enrollment would probably be adversely affected by the new public institution, and that its income might be reduced. In this circumstance it was decided not to make any further tenure appointments in any instructional department of the college. This decision was based upon the assumption that it would be administratively simpler to terminate a non-tenure appointment for reasons of financial exigency than a tenure appointment. I am not at all certain that this assumption is valid, but at least the assumption became the basis of an important administrative decision.

It is my own judgment that for the first time in nearly thirty years many colleges and universities in the United States face the probability of extensive internal adjudication attempting to define upon a case by case basis what constitutes bona fide termination of continuous appointments because of financial exigency. Moreover, an acceptable procedure in such terminations will have to be devised, probably as a result of extensive faculty consultation. Reductions in force have become a fairly common practice in government and in business. With few exceptions, law and collective bargaining agreements specify that such reductions shall be made upon the basis of seniority, those with the lesser years of service being terminated before those with the longer years of service. I am not convinced that this is necessarily the preferable procedure from the point of view of retaining the most professionally competent faculty members. But since no one has yet defined professional competence in terms where objective judgment of that competence can be determined in a rating of one person's performance as against that of another person, I believe seniority may well be the one and only acceptable procedure.

This opinion properly suggests the need to give some attention to the prospects of collective bargaining within higher education. Obviously our attention here is directed toward professional collective bargaining. There is no point in wasting time in discussing collective bargaining with operating staffs, our blue collar and clerical personnel. Such collective bargaining is now an accepted way of life, although for our public colleges and universities there are intricate questions about the legal requirements controlling this bargaining process. Here I am concerned with the prospects for faculty or professional collective bargaining within our colleges and universities.

Let me make clear at the outset that the impetus for faculty collective bargaining arises not so much from faculty concern with separations because of financial exigency as it does from faculty disappointment about the prospect of salary increases. At the same time, I think all of us ought to realize that faculty salary increases can well result in financial exigencies. I do not see how faculty collective bargaining can assert a primary interest in levels of compensation and then not equally confront the necessity for establishing an acceptable procedure for terminating faculty appointments!

If we are to understand the faculty salary situation of our time, we must place this problem in its appropriate economic context. I believe that context is the emergence of a service economy in America. Economists and others have not yet given adequate attention to a simple fact. Of total civilian employment in the United States at the end of 1971, over 60 percent was engaged in service occupations; that is, in wholesale and retail trade; finance, insurance, and real estate; government services, including education; and general services of all kinds. Something less than 40 percent of all employment at the end of 1971 was to be found in agriculture, mining, construction, manufacturing, public utilities, and transportation. The importance of this new division of the labor force is that well over half of all employment is now to be found in jobs which *do not* have a history of rising productivity, that is, of increasing output per unit of labor input.

Our concept of economic growth and even our concept of collective bargaining arose from the sector of the economy involved in the output of goods. But now most of our employment is to be found in the sector of the economy involved in the output of services. Collective bargaining was devised as a procedure to improve the working conditions and to advance the economic share of those laboring in the production of goods, and we now realize that increased wages in the production sector of the economy are non-inflationary to the extent that these increases remain within the limits of labor productivity. Collective bargaining was adapted to the service sector of the economy in large part as a protective device, as a means of obtaining and preserving some wage balance with the production sector. The problem is that increased wages in the service sector are inflationary if the service output is not increased at the same time, or if the wages are not kept within the limits of an advancing productivity of the economy as a whole.

I have before me a copy of a speech delivered by a faculty member before a faculty senate advocating faculty collective bargaining. Without doing any injustice to this speech, I think I can summarize the argument. First, it was argued that faculty collective bargaining was essential in order for faculty wage rates to keep pace with inflation in the American economy. Secondly, it was argued that faculty collective bargaining was essential in order to protect faculty members from demands for increased productivity in rendering instructional service. Thirdly, it was argued that faculty collective bargaining was essential in order to mobilize faculty political power, and to utilize that power to ensure a proper distribution of economic resources to faculty members. It was pointed out that no matter how friendly or how sympathetic the administration of a college or university might be, the administration was not to be trusted to protect and advance faculty interest. The administration was not to be trusted because it had other constituencies to which it had to respond: such as legislators, benefactors, alumni, and students. Finally, it was argued that faculty collective bargaining was essential in order to protect faculty mem-

bers from the hazards of a market place now glutted with an over-supply of Ph.D.'s.

Undoubtedly the idea of faculty collective bargaining has been encouraged by experience in the public sector of employment, such as police, firemen, prison guards, sanitation workers, and transport workers. The employees' association, the teachers' association, and the government union have become familiar forces in the public service, including the public schools. These groups or agencies have had to find an appropriate means of exercising power. The first procedure has been to act as an interest group. The second has been to act as a voter power bloc. And the third procedure has been to act as an industrial union and to assert the right to strike. There is not time here to review the experience of employees' associations and employee unions in the public service. It is sufficient to note that employee negotiations have become an important element in public administration today.

What then are the prospects for faculty organization on our various campuses? The fact, of course, is that faculty collective bargaining does exist today within American higher education. It is estimated that, as of 1972, about one-tenth of all professional employees of colleges and universities are currently covered by a formal collective bargaining agreement. From a questionnaire to which there were 1800 respondents, the National Education Association has stated that it identified 766 institutions in which the governing board had a formal procedure for discussing salary determinations with elected faculty representatives. There are said to be some 100 colleges and universities which have entered into formal collective bargaining agreements. These include the state university system and the city university system in New York.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education has just distributed an article from the February, 1972, issue of *Industrial Relations* on the subject of "Faculty Unionism." The author is Joseph W. Garbarino, professor of business administration and director of the institute of business and economic research at Berkeley. This article should be required reading for every academic administrator, and it would be helpful if faculty members as well were to read and ponder it. Professor Garbarino reviews in particular the experience in faculty collective bargaining in four instances, the City University of New York, Southeastern Massachusetts University, Rutgers University, and Central Michigan University. The four cases are each different one from the other, and each instructive in its own instance.

Incidentally, it is worthwhile to note that faculty collective bargaining has made its most noteworthy advances among public colleges and universities, and in particular among community colleges. Even though the National Labor Relations Board has asserted jurisdiction over private colleges and universities with an income of one million dollars or more, there appears to be less concern with collective bargaining among private institutions than among public institutions. There are several reasons for this

situation. Most community college faculty tend to have been recruited from the ranks of high school teachers, and are familiar with NEA strategies and with professional bargaining. Moreover, they tend to have a sense of being considered inferior to university faculties and seek ways to advance their professional status. In public universities faculty collective bargaining tends to be viewed as a countervailing power to public hostility and legislative indifference toward improvement of faculty compensation.

There are several practical problems which are encountered in the emergence of faculty collective bargaining. The first problem is whether or not a faculty wishes to enter into a procedure of formal collective bargaining with the administration of a college or university. It is not always easy to isolate this issue from the second problem, which is that of the particular bargaining agency to undertake the process of bargaining. There is an advantage in separating the two questions, and in endeavoring to decide first the issue of collective bargaining as against the issue of participatory governance on the part of a faculty within an academic community.

It is currently a part of the strategy of both the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers to insist that collective bargaining is not an alternative to faculty participation in college or university governance. It is widely asserted that a collective bargaining agent is not intended to displace a faculty senate. Although experience in this field is limited, it is difficult to believe that the collective bargaining process, once it is instituted, will not in time displace most other faculty processes of a college-wide or university-wide scope. Presumably, collective bargaining does not concern itself with questions of basic educational policy, such as educational objectives, access to higher education, curriculum, instructional procedures, degree requirements, and evaluation of student performance. But issues of faculty recruitment and tenure, faculty work load, faculty performance standards, and faculty compensation are intimately related to issues of instructional purpose and process, and it surely will not be easy to separate the two.

Extensive faculty debate is currently going on throughout the United States about collective bargaining as a procedure. I would guess that there is scarcely a college or university in the country where the matter has not been debated informally, and there are many instances where the debate is being formally conducted at the present time. I have been observing the situation at one particular university recently, and I was interested to find that the board of trustees upon advice of the president insisted that the faculty vote first and separately upon the issue of collective bargaining as a procedure. Only if there was a majority vote in favor of collective bargaining, the board announced, would it then conduct an election to determine the particular bargaining agency of the faculty.

The case against faculty collective bargaining must necessarily be presented by faculty members themselves. Any argument on this score by administrative officers can only be self-defeating. The case against faculty

collective bargaining begins with the proposition that a faculty union will displace existing faculty bodies concerned with educational purposes and processes. Thus there emerges within faculty ranks some measure of an internal power struggle. Secondly, there is the fear on the part of some faculty members that collective bargaining will result in a mechanical kind of salary structure which will recognize rank and seniority but have little place for merit considerations. Thirdly, it is argued that faculty collective bargaining already exists on an informal basis and that such informal procedure is preferable and more flexible than a carefully prescribed collective bargaining contract. In the fourth place, it is argued that collective bargaining with the administration of a college or university has little practical utility, since salary levels depend upon external factors: the decisions of legislators, the decisions of benefactors, and the decisions of students about the level of charges they are willing to pay. It has even been stated that if faculty members expect to be paid at the level of airline pilots or of plumbers, they should join those professions or occupations. Finally, it has been suggested that substantial faculty salary increases through collective bargaining will result in changed priorities in the allocation of institutional resources, and these changes may or may not be beneficial to the faculty.

It does seem logical to conclude from available evidence that in those institutions where faculty participation has been effectively practiced, and in those circumstances where faculty grievances about working conditions and compensation have not yet become widespread, the impetus toward collective bargaining has been blunted.

The second problem, of course, is that of determining the agency for faculty collective bargaining. There are at least three different groups contending for designation as a faculty collective bargaining agent: the NEA, the AFT, and the AAUP. I have the general impression that the NEA is the most aggressive group at the present time. The 1972 NEA booklet urging collective bargaining is attractive and persuasive. It promises the use of all the resources of the organization to assist faculty groups in forming collective bargaining units and in conducting collective bargaining negotiations. A recent NEA statement declares that as of March of this year, some 36,000 faculty members in higher education were represented in formal collective bargaining agreements by the NEA, contrasted with some 13,000 represented by the AFT, some 4,000 by non-affiliated units, and only 1,700 faculty members represented by the AAUP. The NEA asserts that it has 45 full-time staff members engaged in higher education activities and has extensive research information available for use in the collective bargaining process.

The AAUP seems likely to become somewhat more assertive in the collective bargaining argument. It rests its case upon its long history of concern with academic affairs, and upon the fact that it is not an appendage of a larger organization whose first allegiance is to the welfare of elementary-secondary teachers. An AAUP chapter can and does argue that

it has greater familiarity with local conditions than an outside group, that it is more concerned with preserving traditional academic values, that it recognizes differences in the bargaining position of certain faculty groups such as the law faculty and the medical faculty, and that it seeks cooperative rather than adversary relationships with administrative officers and the board of trustees.

The AFT argues the case of solidarity of professors with the working class of the country. Presumably there is some common enemy or exploiter who must be kept in check. The AFT has frequently insisted that faculty salary increases should be distributed upon the basis of a flat percentage or even the same dollar amount to every faculty member. It has opposed the idea of merit increases as a means whereby the administration rewards its favorite faculty members. The AFT also insists that affiliation with the entire labor organization will result in greater effectiveness as a political interest group.

Obviously, if a faculty as a faculty decides to undertake collective bargaining as a procedure, it must and will then have to determine the collective bargaining agent. There is another problem in this connection, however, and that is the matter of continued status as a collective bargaining agent. Once a faculty determines upon a particular bargaining agent, that agent must in turn be able to retain the allegiance of a substantial proportion of faculty members. Otherwise, a rival group may contend for recognition. The tactics of membership loyalty within a collective bargaining unit have been little discussed in the higher education setting, but the problem is definite and does arise whenever a collective bargaining process is formalized.

The concern with maintenance of membership within a particular collective bargaining unit raises still a fourth problem for colleges and universities. This is the issue of the agency shop. Almost no one today discussing the desirability of faculty collective bargaining is willing to raise the question about the desirability of an agency shop provision in a collective bargaining agreement. But if collective bargaining within the academic community is to follow the path of collective bargaining in an industrial enterprise, the issue of the agency shop is bound to emerge sooner or later. I would guess that it will emerge sooner. The problem of maintenance of membership in a collective bargaining unit has only two solutions. One is collective bargaining militancy. The other is the agency shop agreement. I leave it to your judgment to say which is the preferable situation.

A fifth problem in faculty collective bargaining concerns the scope of membership in the collective bargaining unit. This is the familiar difficulty of defining a faculty member. On the one hand, should a collective bargaining unit include all teaching assistants, and on the other hand, should it include department chairmen, not to mention deans? Should the collective bargaining unit include non-teaching professionals such as the student personnel staff, the library staff, the student health service staff, the recre-

ation staff, the research staff, the continuing education staff? Should the collective bargaining unit include only full-time teaching faculty holding the rank of instructor through full professor, or all part-time teaching faculty? Should the bargaining unit include faculty from all colleges of a university or just those from selected colleges? These are all serious questions, and they have led to some acrimonious argument.

Professor Garbarino points out that in the State University of New York the non-teaching professionals found it desirable to establish their own separate organization and so likewise did the faculty and staff of the various medical and health science centers. Neither group considered that its interests were being served by the recognition of the Senate Professional Association as a collective bargaining agent. It seems probable that as faculty collective bargaining does proceed, more and more groups will decide that they desire separate status and recognition as collective bargaining agents.

Finally, there is the problem of collective bargaining with whom? It is widely assumed that the second party to a process of faculty collective bargaining will be the college or university administration. The legal entity entering into a collective bargaining agreement will be the board of trustees of the individual institution. But just what power does the administration of an institution have to carry out the terms of a collective bargaining agreement? For the moment let us forget about the legal complexities involved in the question for a public college or university whether or not state law provides for a collective bargaining process in the public service. The basic issue is where does the income come from with which to meet the salary and other commitments of a collective bargaining agreement.

A college or university, public or private, is a peculiar enterprise among social institutions insofar as its financing is concerned. A college or university has just as much income as students will pay for instructional services, as clients will pay for sundry services, as benefactors will give for philanthropic reasons as current income or as endowment, and as government will provide in subsidies and grants. The administration and the board of trustees of any individual college or university can scarcely be said to have full control over these various sources of income.

It may be relatively easy for the administration of a college or university to enter into a collective bargaining agreement with the faculty. But implementing the agreement is another matter. To some extent priorities in the allocation of currently available resources may permit some adjustments in faculty compensation and faculty work load. But this may be only a one-time solution. At some point in time the college or university must have more income. Can or will this additional income be forthcoming?

One possible instrument of power, although often claimed as the last resort, is for a faculty to strike. But how effective a weapon is this? When the operating staff of a college or university goes on strike, the institution

cannot long continue in operation. Buildings must be heated and maintained, students fed, garbage and refuse disposed of. If a faculty goes on strike, a college or university must close. If a college or university closes today, will it reopen? The answer is yes, if the reopening occurs within a reasonable period of time. Yet one can never be sure, and my guess is that a public college or university is more likely to reopen and to survive than is a private college or university.

The real target of faculty collective bargaining is the state legislature in the instance of public colleges and universities, and I suppose it is the student body in the instance of a private college or university. If the strike is not an effective means of pressure upon a state legislature, then the other available pressure is that of activity as an interest group. Indeed, in the discussions of faculty collective bargaining which have occurred to date within public colleges and universities, a dual purpose has been asserted. It is generally recognized that a collective bargaining agreement with the administration is but a first step. The second step is to persuade governors and legislators to provide the necessary funding. In this endeavor, faculties must assert such influence as a voter bloc and as a lobbying agency as may be available to them.

The faculty of a private college or university is in a considerably different position. It must be remembered that in the nation as a whole nearly 75 percent of all student enrollments are now to be found in public colleges and universities. And it must be remembered that just as state legislatures provide from 65 to 80 percent of the instructional funds of public colleges and universities, it is the student who provides a similar proportion of the instructional income of the private college or university. If faculty collective bargaining is to be effective in the private college or university, the principal burden of the cost entailed may well fall upon the student.

There remains only a few words to add about the appropriate response of college and university administration to the current interest in faculty collective bargaining. I, for one, refuse to accept the proposition that college or university administration must be cast in the status of an adversary relationship to faculty members. It is with some reluctance that I acknowledge that the role of the administrator is somewhat different from the role of the faculty member within the academic community. I have always insisted and I still do insist that academic administrators and faculty members have a community of interest which far transcends any difference in personal roles. To be sure, the objective of the academic administrator is to preserve and improve an environment of learning. The objective of the faculty member is to transmit and to advance knowledge and to encourage the skillful, ethical utilization of knowledge. The two roles are inescapably intertwined; academic administrator and faculty member are inseparably linked in a common purpose and a great calling.

I have considerable personal sympathy with the faculty concerns of our day which are resulting in an exploration of the case for and against

collective bargaining. I think these concerns have not always been considered in their broadest social, economic, and political context, but I understand the reality of these concerns. In this situation it appears to me futile indeed for administrators to be placed in the position of opposing a predisposition toward collective bargaining. If there are those who think collective bargaining as a procedure will have some magical properties to achieve miracles in higher educational finance, I see no reason for administrators to become defenders of the faith in rationality and reality. I have great confidence that our faculty colleagues will learn from experience.

There is an old aphorism of which I am quite fond. It goes like this. What is the greatest gift of life? Wisdom. And what is wisdom? Good judgment. How does one obtain good judgment? From experience. And how does one obtain experience? From bad judgment.

163 Ways to Save Money, Reduce Costs or Avoid Problems in Personnel Administration*

GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND WORK LOAD MEASUREMENT

1. Recognize that the establishment and publication of goals, objectives, priorities and work load measurement criteria establish the framework for selective allocation of resources.
2. Implement a participatory planning process; involve key people at all levels of organization.
3. Center the principal thrust of the planning process on academic programs and consider first the goals, objectives, priorities and needs of these programs.
4. Derive the goals, objectives, priorities and work loads of the administrative, service and auxiliary departments from the academic program plans.
5. Develop a total systems approach to planning and management which includes the concepts of "team management" and of coordinated planning of goals, objectives, land use, traffic planning, financial planning, and organizational and manpower planning.
6. Insist on the development of "prediction models" and trial budgets of various decisions which provide answers to the "what if" questions. (For example, distribute courses on a day and evening basis to utilize faculty full-time, yet avoid duplication or proliferation of courses and eliminate too-small classes.)
7. Recognize that these kinds of developments will create a backlash (planning creates anti-planning) and plan response to backlash.

---

*This compilation was developed as the topic of discussion for a seminar during the Conference on Confronting the Financial Crisis, in May, 1972. The authors do not concur in all the ideas presented. They were included because one or more institutions of higher education are considering them; these suggestions must be selected or rejected on the basis of individual institutional considerations.

8. Recognize that these kinds of actions do result in the exposure of operating details and the loss of some degree of control over resources at the departmental level, but that spiraling costs and sheer inefficiency pose greater threats to freedom of action.
9. Insist on multiple-year planning.
10. Insist on a planning-budgeting cycle which results in the budget being a fiscal translation of the plan rather than the plan being an outgrowth of the budget.
11. Avoid "creeping incrementalism" in personnel planning and budgeting.
12. Fix accountability for operating within plans and budgets toward established goals and objectives; eliminate excesses beyond institutional capability (e.g., eliminate doctoral programs or reduce university-sponsored research).
13. Insist on the establishment in both academic and support areas of specific (even though rough) work load measurement criteria, e.g., cost per purchase order, cost per square foot of space cleaned, cost per person hired, man-hours per clinical outpatient, cost per student credit-hour, counseling interviews per man-hour, recruitment costs per admissions applicant, etc.
14. Compare unit measurement workload data: actual with plan, externally, internally, trends, projections.

ORGANIZATION ANALYSIS

15. Fix accountability for and conduct systematic organizational analyses on a regular basis.
16. Give particular attention to layers of supervision; they are costly and can stifle initiative and productivity.
17. Develop your own organizational structure and publish it; documenting the structure will identify problems; publishing the structure (with names) will clarify communications.
18. Organize to achieve the particular goals and objectives of YOUR institution; the organization should reflect your goals, objectives and priorities.
19. Titles and boxes do not an organization make; look hard at the assignment of responsibilities and functions, determine that they are clearly defined, then demand accountibility.
20. Avoid dividing an essential function to appease external or internal pressures; for example, the staff responsibility for Affirmative Action logically resides in a single place (the personnel office) rather than in

several organizational places. It costs money to "coordinate the coordinators".

21. Insist on the development and publication for each organizational unit of staffing ratios, data on cost per work load measurement unit, man-hours per work load measurement unit, etc.
22. Discontinue vestigial or peripheral activities and consolidate like functions. Consider utilization of contract services or cooperation with other institutions in administrative activities.
23. Be tough about "creeping incrementalism" in the expansion of existing organizational units; the staffing base may not be right.
24. Be very tough about establishing new organizational units to implement new functions; supervision costs money.
25. Strongly consider the use of "working team" approaches in order to cut across organizational lines to resolve new problems. Utilize faculty for administrative assignments or in other areas; share faculty and courses with other institutions.
26. Recognize that organization should be dynamic and that to "set it and forget it" results in hardening of the organizational arteries and built-in cost increases.
27. Engage in tough but fair organizational performance evaluation: "What have you done for me lately?" Do not promote automatically.
28. In all of the above, be people-oriented; almost any organization will work with the right people and, certainly, no organization will work without the right people.
29. Remember that communications to and from the top ordinarily follow lines of organizational authority which, if unclear or populated by the insecure, will defeat good communications.

WAGES & HOURS, OVERTIME & ABSENCE CONTROL

30. Develop, publish and enforce a clear-cut policy on lost work time regardless of the reason, i.e., absences, tardiness, sick leave, personal days, jury duty, annual military leave, etc.
31. Define absences, etc.; determine absentee and tardiness ratios and their causes; how do they compare with others in your labor market area?
32. Analyze causes by work groups and take steps to correct those causes under your control.
33. Institute campaign to reduce absenteeism. Regardless of existing ratio it can be reduced. Develop counseling program by supervisors and/or personnel staff.

34. Consider an awards program for perfect or good attendance. Utilize group or individual approach.
35. Develop inter-departmental competition as part of reduction program.
36. Restrict or deny payment for first or second day of absence unless substantiated by medical statement or hospitalized.
37. Pay base rate only on paid absences, no shift, supervisory or other pay premiums.
38. Educate all supervisory personnel (academic departments included) in their responsibility to control all aspects of labor costs, not just absence control.
39. Centralize record keeping for better control and uniformity of administration.
40. Possess a good working knowledge of applicable wages and hour laws: Fair Labor Standard Act, Walsh-Healey Act, etc.
41. Devise plan for recording attendance of exempt personnel.
42. Insist on accurate time records, properly signed by employee and supervisor; audit periodically.
43. Remember that personnel reductions beyond a certain point, depending on work load, are just as bad as overstaffing. Premium pay for consistent overtime is expensive; costs are up, efficiency is down.
44. Analyze labor turnover and eliminate causes over which you have control, i.e., poor supervision, excessive work loads, pay inequities, etc.
45. Make supervisory personnel accountable for overtime control in their jurisdiction.
46. Institute high level "prior approval" rule on overtime in all departments including physical plant; failure to do adequate planning does not constitute an "emergency".
47. Consider overtime expenditures exceeding 0.5 percent of total administrative payroll as excessive and worth investigating.
48. Utilize payroll analysis, personnel requisitions, or word-of-mouth reports to uncover "little kingdoms" or "empire builders." Take necessary action.
49. Use a "paid absence" plan, not "sick leave" plan; provide for personal days for valid reasons, religious holidays, etc; limiting plan to sickness fosters dishonesty.
50. Identify chronic or pattern absentees, utilize progressive discipline and warning notices leading to discharge.
51. Realize that high absenteeism and high labor turnover ratios are

many times symptoms of employee dissatisfication or poor management.

FEDERAL LAWS AND REGULATIONS

52. Know the basic requirements of each law and its applicability to your institution. Secure this knowledge by subscribing to any one of the well known personnel services, i.e., Bureau of National Affairs, (BNA), Commerce Clearing House (CCH), or Prentice-Hall. The verbose legal vernacular is reduced to everyday language and interpreted.
53. Realize that the Federal government means business in all of these areas, but the pressure is the greatest in the areas of Affirmative Action, (through several governmental agencies) and safety and health, as a result of the Occupational Safety and Health Act.
54. Consult with the nearest office of the applicable agency for advice and guidance. Don't be afraid the agency will be out to your school the next day.
55. Adopt a policy concerning unemployment insurance claims and apply it uniformly; i.e., don't oppose a staff claim and then let an improper faculty claim go unchallenged.
56. Establish a policy of a centralized review in advance on all terminations. Conduct exit interviews. (An effective personnel staff should be doing this now).
57. Change your termination forms and procedures so that all pertinent facts are accurate and at hand in the personnel function.
58. Oppose all invalid unemployment claims, faculty included; follow through to conclusion.
59. Watch for and oppose claims during periods of leave.
60. Investigate possible savings in the use of a specialist to handle unemployment claims.
61. Review your maternity leave policy. A set date for a mandatory leave, e.g. beginning of 5th month, will in many states make the employee eligible for unemployment insurance benefits. Further, such a policy probably would be held discriminatory under the USDL Sex Guidelines which say that maternity leave (1) is a right of employment, (2) must be individually determined and for a reasonable length of time, and (3) be treated the same as other leaves.
62. Utilize manpower planning and make more effective use of staff to avoid recess lay-offs; i.e., transfer food service personnel to dormitory custodial duties during academic recesses to accomplish major cleaning or renovation projects.

63. Check suspected malingering in Workman's Compensation cases.
64. Schedule staff vacations during all academic recess periods; drop traditional vacation period approach of June through August. Spread long 3 and 4 week vacations over several recess periods.
65. Assign OSHA responsibility to one individual, appoint Safety and Health Committee. Chief executive officer issue statement giving support to program (no program will succeed unless top administration gives it full support).
66. Draft list of suspected violations and hazards, estimate costs, rate or assign priorities, start work immediately to clear priority list. Planning your work and working your plan will spread costs and probably avoid claims.

RECRUITING AND STAFFING

67. Carefully examine the need for jobs before they are created and specifically assign this responsibility to an individual with no ax to grind.
68. Reserve to the president the approval of all new positions.
69. Assign responsibility for and ensure the annual conduct of a hard-nosed review of need for all full-time positions; sometimes positions are created to serve a particular historical need, then "converted" to serve other needs which may not be legitimate; it is not necessarily true that additional work load requires additional staff.
70. Have someone prepare, at least annually, an analysis of full-time clerical/full-time professional staff (faculty) ratios by department; evaluate comparatively and use as basis for cuts or additions. Institute a January-to-January pay year, with increases based upon known enrollment and income. Effect promotional increases in September.
71. Reduce some staff appointments from twelve months to nine months, particularly in areas with low or no summer work loads, or utilize by inter-departmental transfer such personnel as vacation replacements in other departments. Avoid replacing retiring individuals when possible.
72. Reevaluate minimum hiring standards (reference: *Rowe v. General Motors*, Fifth Circuit Court, March 2, 1972). Unreasonably strict qualifications for employment will present problems under Affirmative Action and unnecessarily increase salaries.
73. Ensure a review of the validity of each step in the total selection process as outlined in U.S. Labor Department Order No. 4.

74. Record in detail all actions taken during recruitment and selection as a record of "good faith selection" as required by Order No. 4.
75. Secure a briefing on USDL Order No. 4, *Griggs v. Duke Power Company* (U.S. Supreme Court, March 8, 1971), and *Rowe v. General Motors* (*op cit*).
76. Ensure the preparation of an annual analysis, by budget unit, of full-time equivalent staffing to some appropriate work load measurement unit for that budget entity. Trend for five years.
77. Restrict or discontinue payment of agency fees.
78. Restrict or discontinue payment of moving expenses.
79. Develop clerical and other labor pools.
80. Redesign some highly skilled jobs so that some duties can be performed by others for less money. Hire professional staff at lowest possible entry level.
81. Substitute equipment for people or skills; e.g., dictation equipment is cheaper than shorthand in the long run.
82. Rearrange space assignments to permit use of clerical pools and common-use equipment.
83. Avoid capital plant planning which entails staffing patterns and new staff needs you can't afford.

COMPENSATION

84. Recognize that efficient compensation results from the proper balance among three factors: (1) ability to pay, (2) appropriate labor market considerations, and (3) internal consistency (considerations of job content and individuals in relation to others).
85. View compensation as *total* compensation (cash plus benefits plus perquisites) and make internal and external comparisons on this basis, not just on basis of cash alone. Review such practices as subsidized housing, sabbaticals, and faculty/staff travel.
86. Insist on the use of valid labor market surveys of appropriate labor markets. The market for top administrators and faculty may be national, but the market for clerical and maintenance workers is local. The key question in selecting the appropriate labor market are: (1) what is the usual geographical scope of the recruiting search for the position, and (2) which employer, if any, hires the largest number of people in this category and, therefore, dominates the market?
87. Investigate, identify and take corrective action on sex discrimination *before* ordered to do so after a compliance review; it's cheaper.
88. Insist on the establishment and annual review and maintenance of

compensation plans for professional administrative staff and for non-professional staff.

89. Avoid or eliminate specific dollar step increases in order to give flexibility in line with ability to pay.

90. Invest in a compensation management information system which will identify problem areas; tie into Affirmative Action Plan so that information may be reported on the basis of salary level, type of appointment, age, race, sex, etc.

91. Cooperate with area schools to cut the costs of local and regional compensation surveys; use Bureau of Labor Statistics data and other accepted surveys where available.

92. Use compensation surveys prepared by the U.S. Office of Education (HEGIS) and the College and University Personnel Association for national market data on professional administrative positions.

93. Use work-study funding to the fullest to alleviate need for full-time staffing.

94. Seriously reconsider practices for the payment of part-time faculty on a pro rata share of full-time faculty salaries; consider changing the rationale to reduce these salary levels where labor market availability permits.

95. Clearly assign the function of compensation plans and hold that individual accountable for market surveys, maintenance of compensation plans and reporting to top management.

96. Capture in a central fund for rebudgeting all salary lapse funds instead of allowing them to remain for alternate use by budget entities.

Reference: 1971-72 *Administrative Compensation Survey*, College and University Personnel Association, March 1972.

SUPERVISION AND TRAINING

97. Define the duties and responsibilities of each supervisory position.

98. Develop members of supervision as institutional symbols; in the eyes of their subordinates they are the institution.

99. Make supervisors feel they are, in fact, a part of the Administration. Keep them informed on major institutional plans in which they have an interest. Sharing of inside knowledge increases identity quotient of supervision.

100. Help your supervisors become better supervisors. Conduct periodic evaluations, point out weaknesses and ways to overcome; compliment on strengths. Establish personal goals through mutual agree-

ment, not superior's unilateral action. Initiate a suggestion system for methods to increase efficiency and economize (follow up suggestions by some type of reward or recognition).

101. Utilize management by objectives approach; establish department or group goals, review periodically, establish philosophy of accountability for goals attainment.

102. Provide applicable status symbols, e.g., telephone, adequate privacy, name plates, etc.

103. Compute and monitor departmental absenteeism, labor turnover, accident frequency and severity, overtime. Let them know where they stand.

104. Encourage two-way communications between top administration and supervisory staff. Periodically schedule "rap" sessions with the top brass.

105. Provide as much decision-making power as possible to supervision.

106. Establish and publicize policy of promotion from within; post openings for all levels.

107. Educate and train supervision in good supervisory practices; e.g., organizational goals, philosophy and structure; working under union contracts, grievance handling (even in the absence of a union), good supervisory practices, employee counseling, discipline, delegation, absence control, safety and health, departmental budget preparation, etc.

108. Provide adequate salary in relation to subordinates including overtime; 20 percent differential is generally accepted.

109. Weigh comparative advantages and disadvantages of payment for supervisory overtime. A true supervisor is an exempt employee under FLSA, thus time and a half is not required for overtime hours; straight time may be adequate, "Comp Time" may also be used.

110. Encourage visits to other organizations in respective area of responsibility, participation in local supervisory organizations.

111. Terminate or transfer to non-supervisory positions supervisors who do not perform.

112. Utilize women in supervisory positions.

BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

113. Consolidate administration in one individual or department; personnel function would in most institutions be preferable.

114. Communicate the benefits and costs to faculty and staff. 80-90 per-

cent do not realize what benefits they have and probably 100 percent don't realize the costs to institutions or, more importantly, the replacement cost on the outside.

115. Have faculty and staff participate in cost if liberalization of program is planned.

116. Gear program to needs of group; beyond a certain point there are diminishing returns in a benefit offering.

117. Avoid flat dollar amounts in life coverage, relate coverage to salary.

118. Remember in benefit planning, the higher salaried individuals are most likely older and, thus, increased life coverage becomes more costly on two counts, i.e., greater coverage and higher rate.

119. Calculate total benefit program costs, compare with comparable institutions. U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 1969, employee benefit costs averaged out at $2,052 per employee, .983¢ per hour or 27.9 percent of payroll – no longer a "fringe" cost.

120. Utilize a front and deductible and coordination-of-benefits (COB) program in your medical and health plans. The latter will substantially reduce unnecessary duplication of benefits and reduce costs.

121. Undertake to maintain a continuing procedure to detect malingering in all health plans. Utilize personnel or health service departments.

122. Consider the use of benefits consultant.

123. Study advisability of adopting a decreasing schedule of life insurance as age increases. Personal insurance needs reduce as age increases. mortgages are paid off, children are out of school, etc. Life insurance cost at 60 years can run from 5 to 10 times cost at age 30.

124. Study institution's TIAA re-purchase policy for possible recapture of some funds.

125. Adopt tax sheltered annuity approach to increase current "take home" pay.

126. Utilize data processing techniques to provide information required for annual reports, audits, etc. of your several benefit plans. In addition to saving much time, reduces UQ (ulcer quotient).

127. Review very closely life coverage in retirement. Life coverage with an active employee is "if coverage"; with a retired employee it is "when coverage", since death is a certainty. Are the amounts unreasonable? Are you merely adding to the value of the estate or really filling a need?

128. Beware of paying for benefits for some groups (e.g., faculty or men) and not for others (e.g., staff or women). Equal benefits are required under Affirmative Action.

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS

129. Utilize available resources in designing the system; these include items required for the Higher Education General Information Survey plus information available from the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at WICHE (especially the *Data Element Dictionary: Staff*).

130. If you have not already done so, investigate and become a participant in the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at WICHE.

131. Be sure to include data elements required by Department of Labor Orders No. 4 and 14 on Affirmative Action and Compliance Reviews, respectively.

132. Centralize all official personnel records and assign to one person (personnel officer) authority for system design coordination, implementation and maintenance.

133. Encourage broad participation within the institution in the design of the system; it will have greater use and support from those who participated in its design.

134. Require that the system produce needed information for all levels of management, including the President and the Governing Board.

135. Keep it simple–too much information is sometimes worse than none.

136. Specify the information that YOU want–refuse to see it all; insist on summary data, "highlighted" reports, identification of extreme highs and lows, analysis and recommendations.

137. Insist on comparative data: actual with plan, externally, internally, trends, projections.

138. Utilize both recurring and one-time reports.

139. Strike an effective balance between quantitative and qualitative (subjective) data.

140. Insist that the data be in a useful, graphic format which is easily understood and that reports go to the people who need them.

141. Recognize that elaborate systems sometimes provide outdated or too much information.

142. Design your system to overcome the principle that "bad news doesn't travel up until it's too late" and create a climate which encourages upward information flow.

LABOR RELATIONS

143. Establish an effective two way communication program NOW, before

the union knocks on your door. Communicate your strengths! Cultivate and use the grapevine.

144. Analyze and study your personnel function and your personnel program; is it in order? Work on your weaknesses!

145. Avoid the use of negative nomenclature in all forms of communication, i.e., "Non-Academic" Staff, Director of "Non-Academic" Personnel; substitute "Personnel", "Support Staff", etc.

146. Utilize experienced outside professionals, i.e., legal counsel and consultants, throughout union organizing campaign, especially if you have none on your staff.

147. Plan your counter campaign, make it flexible; make it pro-Administration, not anti-Union.

148. Re-educate supervision in your personnel and benefit programs in their rights and responsibilities during and after campaign, win or lose.

149. Determine "appropriate bargaining unit" in advance; i.e., should custodial be included with skilled trades, should law school faculty or department chairmen be included with balance of faculty?

150. Avoid "fragmentation" of units; i.e., custodial employees in several locations in same general geographical area should in most cases be in same unit; faculty in one unit, not broken up by departments or schools.

151. Avoid having the chief executive officer as a member of the bargaining team. He and the Board are your "aces-in-the-hole"; just as the union will have to "go back to the membership" the administration team should be able to go back to someone or some group. Final authority should never be present at the bargaining table, unless it is the last or signing session.

152. Remember your union contract will most likely be in existence longer than any other contract you have. Make it strong the first time and don't weaken it in subsequent negotiations–build strength upon strength!

153. Test contract language in several applicable campus situations, consult key personnel before final agreement.

154. Use arbitration only as a last resort and then only when the chances of winning are greatly in your favor.

155. Weigh costs of single arbitrator vs. tripartite panel. A good arbitrator with a good case should make a three man group unnecessary.

156. Use only well prepared, experienced personnel for presentation in arbitration proceedings. If your personnel people are experienced, it is far better for them to make the presentation than to engage a lawyer. Presentation will be less legalistic and the cost lower.

157. Avoid use of transcripts of arbitration cases unless the case is complicated or very important.

158. Develop a workable procedure through which grievances may be filed in unorganized groups. The "Open Door" policy is a myth!

159. Settle grievances at lowest possible level.

160. Avoid unnecessary meetings with the union. Keep length of meetings to a minimum.

161. Establish (in contract if necessary) control and penalties on time spent by Steward or other union officials in processing grievances or other union business.

162. Don't be a "Reluctant Dragon" in labor matters; be fair but firm.

163. Understand the problems of your labor relations people. Discuss important situations with them.

Reference: *Labor Relations in Higher Education*, College and University Personnel Association, 1971.

OTHER MANAGEMENT DIVISION PUBLICATIONS

BY 1990: DOUBLED ENROLLMENTS, TRIPLED COSTS. Charts showing the chronic financial squeeze with which most urban universities will have to learn to live $3.00

MEETING THE FINANCIAL PINCH AT ONE UNIVERSITY. The university is Princeton; the saving—one million dollars—reflects the impact of Provost William Bowen's incisive memorandum explaining why the University needed to tighten its belt . . . . . Free

BLACK STUDIES: HOW IT WORKS AT TEN UNIVERSITIES. After the ideological furor dies down, there are these management problems to solve: organization, faculty, money $3.00

319 WAYS COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ARE MEETING THE FINANCIAL PINCH. An expanded check-list of practices being used right now to save money and increase income . . . . . Free

THE ADVANTAGES OF WORK-STUDY PLANS. In addition to helping balance a university budget, work-study can attract capable students who need a chance to earn their way, and make education more relevant for all students . . . . . Free

SURVIVAL THROUGH CHANGE. A case study of a privately supported urban university's plan to fight the budget squeeze . . . . . Free

A GUIDE TO PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS. Second expanded edition of a handbook identifying over 125 useful workshops, conferences, internships and fellowships scheduled for 1972 . . . Free*

RESCUE BEGINS AT HOME. Highlights of *To Turn the Tide* (Father Paul C. Reinert, President of St. Louis University), including an 11-point self-help plan other institutions can follow . . . . . Free

PUTTING COOPERATION TO WORK. A survey of how voluntary cooperation is helping colleges and universities . . . . . Free

Please make checks or money orders payable to:
Academy for Educational Development, Inc.

*Single copies are free; additional copies are $2.00 each.

There will be charges for quantity orders of most publications. We will be pleased to provide, at your request, information on these charges.

The Academy for Educational Development, Inc., is a nonprofit tax-exempt planning organization which pioneered in the field of long-range planning for colleges, universities, and state systems of higher education. It has conducted over 100 major studies for institutions throughout the country, as well as for national agencies such as the U.S. Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, the Agency for International Development, and the National Institutes of Health. Additional information regarding the Academy's complete program of services to education may be obtained from its offices:

New York:
437 Madison Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10022
(212) 758-5454

Washington:
1424 Sixteenth St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 265-5576

Palo Alto:
770 Welch Road
Palo Alto, California 94304
(415) 327-2270

Akron:
55 Fir Hill
Akron, Ohio 44304
(216) 434-2414 or 253-8225

The Academy's Management Division was established in 1970, under grants primarily from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, to help college and university presidents and other officials improve the administration of the nation's institutions of higher learning. To achieve this purpose, the Management Division conducts research, publishes the results, and organizes conferences and professional development programs.

For further information about the Management Division, write or call:

Management Division
Academy for Educational Development, Inc.
1424 Sixteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 265-5576

Single copies of this publication are available from the Academy at no charge.